

REMARKS

Summary of the Amendment

Upon entry of the present amendment, Claims 2-3, 7, 9 and 15-16 will have been amended. Accordingly, Claims 1-5 and 7-16 remain currently pending. By the present Amendment and Remarks, Applicant believes that Claims 1-5 and 7-16 are allowable, and respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding Office Action and allowance of the present application.

Summary of the Official Office Action

In the Office Action of November 29, 2004, Claims 2-3, 9 and 15 are objected to over formal matters; Claims 3 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite; Claims 1-5, 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated over art of record; and Claims 7-10, 12 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over art of record.

Election with Traverse

In the Office Action, the Examiner has asserted that the application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention.

The Examiner submits that the species are as follows:

- I. Figs. 1-5; and
- II. Figs. 6-11.

The Examiner has requested the Applicant to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The Examiner does submit that Claim1 appears to be generic.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has omitted one of the two criteria for proper restriction requirement now established by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office policy. That is, as set forth in M.P.E.P. § 803, “an appropriate explanation” must be advanced by the Examiner as to the existence of a “serious burden” if restriction is required.

While the Examiner has alleged a possible distinction between the identified species, the Examiner has not shown that a concurrent examination of each species would present a “serious burden”. Applicant respectfully submits that the search for the combination of features recited in the claims of the individual species, if not totally co-extensive, would appear to have a very substantial degree of overlap. Because the search for each species of the invention is likely to be substantially the same, Applicant submits that no undue or serious burden would be presented in concurrently examining species I and II. Thus, for the above noted reasons, in consistent with the office policy set forth above in M.P.E.P. § 803, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider withdrawal of the species election requirement in this application.

In light of the aforementioned reasons, the Examiner’s election of species is believed to be improper. Nevertheless, Applicant has elected, with traverse, the invention defined by Figures 1-5.

Objections to the Claims

The Examiner submits that the following claim language is object thereto: in lines 2-3 of Claim 2, the recitation “a ground surface”; and in line 2 of Claim 3 and line 3 of Claim 9, the recitation “the ground”. The Examiner submits that the aforementioned recitations are awkward since it is not permitted to claim part of the earth. The Examiner suggests using the wording --- a supporting surface of the trailer ---, or a similar recitation. Furthermore, the Examiner notes that in line 2 of Claim 15, the word “removable” should be --- removably ---.

As suggested by the Examiner, Applicant has made the aforementioned amendments to Claims 2-3, 9 and 15 to expedite prosecution.

Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the pending objections to the claims.

Traversal of Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claims 3 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner submits that the recitation “the ground” in Claims 3 and 9 does not have sufficient antecedent basis.

As suggested by the Examiner, Applicant has amended Claims 3 and 9 by deleting the phrase “the ground” and replacing it with --- a supporting surface of the trailer ---.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Traversal of Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claims 1-5, 11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,340,145 to Leib et al. [hereinafter “LEIB”].

The Examiner contends that LEIB teaches, *inter alia*, “a first planar deck (62) substantially covering the first upper platform”; and, “a second planar deck (46) substantially covering the second upper platform”; . . .

A Review of LEIB

Figs. 1-7 of LEIB disclose a collapsible trailer 20 which includes a front platform 22 and a rear platform 24 pivotably mounted to the front platform 22.

As more particularly shown in Fig. 6, rear platform 24 includes a triangular frame 30 having a base 32, a first leg 34 and a second leg 36. A cross bar 38 extends parallel to base 32 across a portion of triangle 30 where leg 34 intersects leg 36. A first rail 40 is mounted on cross bar 38, leg 34 and base 32. A second rail 42 is fixedly disposed on cross bar 38, leg 36 and base 32 substantially parallel with rail 40. A third rail 44 is mounted on cross bar 38, first leg 34, second leg 36 and base 32 of triangle 30 and disposed between and substantially parallel to rails 40, 42. Each rail 40, 42, 44 has a floor 46 extending into opposing sides 44 forming a channel therebetween. The width of the channel is dimensioned to receive and guide a motorcycle tire therein. By mounting rails 40, 42, 44 on triangle frame 30 and cross bar 38, rails 40, 42, 44 are maintained fixed relative to each other. Additionally, by extending support members in the form of base 32, legs 34, 36 and cross bar 38, a support frame work is provided for supporting rails 40, 42, 44 which share the load between rails 40, 42, 44 without utilizing a great deal of material. This reduces the weight of rear platform 24 as well as reducing the complexity of the design.

Front platform 22 has a similar construction to that of rear platform 24. A triangular frame 50 is formed with a base 52, first leg 54 and second leg 56 which are joined together to form a triangle. Base 52, legs 54 and 56 are formed of tubular steel. A first rail 58 is fixedly supported between base 52 and first leg 54. The second rail 60 is also supported on triangular frame 50 between base 52 and second leg 56. A third rail 62 is fixedly mounted on triangle 50 between base 52, first leg 54 and second leg 56. Bike rails 40-44, and rails 58, 60 and 62 are each formed with a floor 66 which separates sides 68 to form a channel through each respective rail. Each of rails 58, 60 and 62 is formed at one end with a ramp portion 70, 72 and 74, respectively, which extend at an angle upward from floor 62 to provide a front stop within the channel floor by each respective rail. Rear platform 24 is pivotably connected to front platform 22 at rail pairs 40, 58; 44, 62; and 42, 60.

Reference is made to Fig. 7 in which the pivotable connection between rail 40 and 58 is shown by way of example. It is further noted that each remaining rail pair is similarly coupled. Accordingly, trailer 20 may collapse on itself by folding in half, by pivoting either rail 40 or rail 58 about the axis formed by bolts 88, 90.

Applicant's Independent Claim 1

Applicant's independent Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a first planar deck substantially covering said first upper platform; and a second planar deck substantially covering said second platform; Applicant submits that LEIB does not teach at least the aforementioned features.

In particular, as is stated in paragraph [0048] of the specification, the present invention utilizes forward decking 32 and rear decking 34, which are preferably formed from diamond plate. As best shown in Figs. 1-2, forward decking 32 is attached to the upper surfaces of the forward support section 9, while the rear decking 34 is attached to the upper surfaces of the foldable rear support section 10. It is also noted in paragraph [0048], that any other plate material known in the art may be utilized.

On the other hand, LEIB simply does not teach, *inter alia*, a first planar deck substantially covering said first upper platform; and a second planar deck substantially covering said second platform; At most, LEIB only teaches channel-shaped rails 40, 42,

44 *which simply only span the triangular frame 30 and cross bar 38*. In the same fashion, rails 58, 60 and 62 *merely only span the triangular frame 50*. What the Examiner considers as “a first planar deck (62) substantially covering the first upper platform” is inappropriately construed, and does not amount to a proper §102 rejection. In the same light, it is not possible that the LEIB rail 46 substantially covers the forward platform 22 as the Examiner purports. Thus, Applicant submits that the LEIB channel-shaped members 40, 42, 44, 58, 62 and 60 simply do not meet the definition of a “*planar deck*” “*substantially covering*” a platform as has been recited in Applicant’s independent Claim 1.

Because LEIB lacks at least the above-noted features of the present invention, Applicant submits that LEIB fails to disclose each and every feature recited in independent Claim 1, and that the Examiner failed to establish an adequate evidentiary basis to support a rejection of anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Therefore, Applicant submits that the Examiner’s rejection of at least independent Claim 1 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the stated rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and to indicate that independent Claim 1 is allowable over the art of record.

Dependent Claims 2-5, 11 and 13

Furthermore, Applicant submits that dependent Claims 2-5, 11 and 13 are allowable at least for the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent Claim 1 and recite additional features that further define the present invention.

Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the stated rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and indicate that dependent Claims 2-5, 11 and 13 are allowable over the art of record.

Traversal of Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The LEIB Rejection:

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claims 7, 10 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over LEIB.

Dependent Claim 7

In regard to Claim 7, the Examiner submits that LEIB discloses all the features recited in Claim 7 except that the motorcycle rail and wheel chock assembly (Fig. 1, item 62) of LEIB is fixedly rather than removably attached to the first upper platform. The Examiner then states, however, that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the instant invention was made to have modified the trailer disclosed by LEIB to have the motorcycle guide rail and wheel chock assembly removably attached to the first upper platform, since it has been held that constructing a formally integral structure in various elements involves only routine skill in the art, (*Nerwin v. Erlichman*, 168 U.S.P.Q. 177, 179). The Examiner further submits that it would have been obvious to make this assembly selectively removable and separable from the trailer first upper platform as an engineering design choice in order to provide easy conversion to one or the other of the trailer multi-configurations contemplated by LEIB (column 6, lines 45-51).

Applicant's dependent Claim 7 recites as amended recites, *inter alia*, the trailer . . . further comprising at least one motorcycle guide rail and a pivotable wheel chock assembly removably attached to said first upper platform. Applicant submits that LEIB does not teach or suggest at least the aforementioned features.

Applicant submits that the manner in which the Examiner proposes to modify LEIB destroys the LEIB reference. As stated above, the Examiner submits that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the instant invention was made to have modified the trailer disclosed by LEIB to have the motorcycle guide rail and wheel chock assembly removably attached to the first upper platform." However, the LEIB trailer is not designed to have any of the channel-shaped members 40, 42, 44, 58, 62 and 60 to be removed. In particular, the LEIB channel-shaped members 40, 42 and 44 are hinged to channel-shaped members 58, 62 and 60. And in more particularity, the aforementioned members are attached to each other via pivot features 82, 84, 86, 88, 90, 92, 94. The hinges are what allows the front platform 22 to be attached to the rear platform 24. Thus, the manner in which the front platform 22 and rear platform 24 are attached, is essential to the overall structure of the LEIB trailer. If at least one of channel-shaped members 40, 42, 44, 58, 62 and 60 would be removed, the LEIB

trailer would not have its intended structural integrity which is dependent on the three LEIB hinge interfaces.

Additionally, the LEIB wheel stops 70, 72 and 74 are not pivotable as is taught by the present invention (see paragraph [0055]). Therefore, even if the Examiner's proposed modification is appropriate (which Applicant does not acquiesce thereto), it still does not result in the invention recited in dependent Claim 7.

Additionally, as already discussed above in the §102 rejection traversal, Applicant submits that LEIB simply does not teach, *inter alia*, a first planar deck substantially covering said first upper platform; and a second planar deck substantially covering said second platform; . . . as is recited in independent Claim 1. Thus, Applicant submits that dependent Claim 7 is also allowable at least for the reason that this claim depends from allowable independent Claim 1 and recites additional features that further define the present invention.

Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the stated rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of dependent Claim 7 and indicate that the claim is allowable over the art of record.

Dependent Claim 10

Regarding Claim 10, the Examiner submits that LEIB discloses all the features of Claim 10 except that LEIB uses rectangular section steel tube members to construct the first and second tubular frames. The Examiner then contends, however, that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the disclosure of LEIB to instead form the first and second tubular frame of steel having a round section since it has been generally held to be within the skill of a worker in the art to make an element of any shape as a matter of obvious engineering choice when the shape is not for any stated reason or any particular purpose.

As already discussed above in the §102 rejection traversal, Applicant submits that LEIB simply does not teach, *inter alia*, a first planar deck substantially covering said first upper platform; and a second planar deck substantially covering said second platform; . . . as is recited in independent Claim 1. Thus, Applicant submits that dependent Claim 10 is also

allowable at least for the reason that this claim depends from allowable independent Claim 1 and recites additional features that further define the present invention.

Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the stated rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of dependent Claim 10 and indicate that the claim is allowable over the art of record.

Dependent Claim 16

In regard to Claim 16, the Examiner contends that LEIB discloses all the features of the claim except that LEIB is silent regarding the size of the trailer flatbed platform. The Examiner then contends, that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the instant invention was made to have modified the disclosure of LEIB regarding the size of the trailer platform, including the size of the platform to be approximately 5 ft. by 7 ft. when the trailer is in its deployed orientation as simple design choice since it has been held that such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component.

Applicant's dependent Claim 16 recites as amended recites, *inter alia*, . . . , wherein when said trailer is deployed and said at least one motorcycle guide rail and wheel chock assembly is removed, said generally horizontally oriented common planar platform provides a flat bed platform *having no voids disposed through the flat bed platform*. Applicant submits that LEIB does not teach or suggest at least the aforementioned features.

On the other hand, even if the proposed modification with respect to the size of the trailer is appropriate, LEIB still does not teach a flat bed platform *having no voids disposed through the flat bed platform*. Rather, since the LEIB trailer does not even have a first and second planar deck, it is not designed to provide a flat bed platform adapted to carry other items besides motorcycles. Instead, because the LEIB trailer provides no flat bed platform, the front platform 22 and rear platform 24 are essentially not covered, except only where the channel-shaped members 40, 42, 44, 58, 62 and 60 are located. And if at least some of the aforementioned members are removed, as Claim 16 recites, then the LEIB trailer provides essentially no common planar platform which provides a flat bed platform as recited in Claim 16.

Furthermore, Applicant submits that dependent Claim 16 is allowable at least for the reason that this claims depends from allowable independent Claims 1 and 7 and recites additional features that further define the present invention.

As already made clear with respect to independent Claim 1 (of which Claim 16 is dependent on from Claim 7), Applicant's independent Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a first planar deck substantially covering said first upper platform; and a second planar deck substantially covering said second platform; . . . Applicant once again submits that LEIB does not teach at least the aforementioned features of which are also included in Claim 16 since Claim 16 is dependent on Claim 1.

Furthermore, as already discussed with respect to Claim 7 (of which Claim 16 is directly dependent on), Applicant's Claim 7 recites, *inter alia*, the trailer . . . further comprising at least one motorcycle guide rail and a pivotable wheel chock assembly removably attached to said first upper platform. Applicant once again submits that LEIB does not teach at least the aforementioned features of which are also included in Claim 16 since Claim 16 is dependent on Claim 7.

Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the stated rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of dependent Claim 16 and indicate that the claim is allowable over the art of record.

The LEIB in View of JOHNSTON Rejection:

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over LEIB in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,102,370 to Johnston [hereinafter "JOHNSTON"].

The Examiner submits that LEIB discloses all the claim features except that LEIB is silent regarding the provision of a loading ramp that may have one end of the ramp attached to the rear end of the rear support section of the trailer and the other end of the ramp positioned to engage the trailer supporting surface. However, the Examiner then contends that JOHNSTON teaches a trailer (Fig. 1, item 10) having loading ramps 110 that may be attached to a rear end of the rear support section of the trailer and the other end of the ramp positioned to engage the trailer's ground supporting surface (column 8, lines 46-55). The Examiner then submits, that it

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the instant invention was made to have modified the trailer of LEIB in accordance with the teachings of JOHNSTON to include removable loading ramps each having one end that may be attached to a rear end of the trailer's rear support section and that the other end of ramp positioned to engage the ground, the ramps being adapted to be stored within the rear support section of the trailer as an obvious means to facilitate loading and unloading of a motorcycle or other object being transported on the trailer.

As already discussed above in the §102 rejection traversal, Applicant submits that LEIB simply does not teach, *inter alia*, a first planar deck substantially covering said first upper platform; and a second planar deck substantially covering said second platform; . . . as is recited in independent Claim 1. Furthermore, JOHNSTON does not teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a first planar deck substantially covering said first upper platform; and a second planar deck substantially covering said second platform; . . . as is recited in independent Claim 1. Hence, it is submitted that neither LEIB or JOHNSTON, whether considered individually or in combination, still do not teach the aforementioned features recited in allowable independent Claim 1.

Thus, Applicant submits that dependent Claims 8 and 9 are also allowable at least for the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent Claim 1 and recite additional features that further define the present invention.

Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the stated rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of dependent Claims 8 and 9 and indicate that these claims are allowable over the art of record.

The LEIB in View of HARRINGTON Rejection:

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over LEIB in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,557, 882 to Harrington [hereinafter "HARRINGTON"].

The Examiner submits that LEIB discloses all the features of Claim 14 except that LEIB is silent regarding a provision of removable stone guard positioned in a forward region of the forward support section of the trailer. The Examiner then submits, however, that

HARRINGTON teaches a trailer having removable stone guards positioned in a forward region of the forward support section of a trailer (Figs. 12, combination of items 84 and 86). The Examiner contends that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the instant invention was made to have modified the disclosed trailer of LEIB to include a removable stone guard removably positioned in a forward region of the forward support section of the trailer as taught by HARRINGTON in order to protect the motorcycle or other objects being transported on the trailer from debris during motion of the trailer behind the towing vehicle.

As already discussed above in the §102 rejection traversal, Applicant submits that LEIB simply does not teach, *inter alia*, a first planar deck substantially covering said first upper platform; and a second planar deck substantially covering said second platform; . . . as is recited in independent Claim 1. Furthermore, HARRINGTON does not teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a first planar deck substantially covering said first upper platform; and a second planar deck substantially covering said second platform; . . . as is recited in independent Claim 1. Hence, it is submitted that neither LEIB or HARRINGTON, whether considered individually or in combination, still do not teach the aforementioned features recited in allowable independent Claim 1.

Thus, Applicant submits that dependent Claim 14 is also allowable at least for the reason that this claim depends from allowable independent Claim 1 and recites additional features that further define the present invention.

Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the stated rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of dependent Claim 14 and indicate that the claim is allowable over the art of record.

The LEIB in View of HISS Rejection:

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over LEIB in view of Great Britain Patent No. 2044193 to Hiss [hereinafter "HISS"].

The Examiner submits that LEIB discloses all the features of Claim 12 except that LEIB is silent regarding a provision of a spare tire and wheel stored within the recessed underneath the

first platform. The Examiner then submits, however, that HISS discloses a multi-purpose trailer having a spare tire and wheel stored within a recessed underneath a platform of the trailer. Then the Examiner contends, that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the instant invention was made to have modified the disclosure of LEIB in accordance with the teachings of HISS to include a spare tire and wheel stored within the recessed underneath the first upper platform of the trailer as disclosed in LEIB in order to provide with the trailer itself a readily accessible spare tire and wheel. The Examiner then further contends that although the HISS teaches the spare tire and wheel stored beneath the rear most platform of the trailer, that it would have been obvious to relocate the spare to a position underneath the first upper platform of the trailer since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Japikse*, 86 U.S.P.Q. 70.

As already discussed above in the §102 rejection traversal, Applicant submits that LEIB simply does not teach, *inter alia*, a first planar deck substantially covering said first upper platform; and a second planar deck substantially covering said second platform; . . . as is recited in independent Claim 1. Furthermore, HISS does not teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a first planar deck substantially covering said first upper platform; and a second planar deck substantially covering said second platform; . . . as is recited in independent Claim 1. Hence, it is submitted that neither LEIB or HISS, whether considered individually or in combination, still do not teach the aforementioned features recited in allowable independent Claim 1.

Thus, Applicant submits that dependent Claim 12 is also allowable at least for the reason that this claim depends from allowable independent Claim 1 and recites additional features that further define the present invention.

Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the stated rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of dependent Claim 12 and indicate that this claim is allowable over the art of record.

The LEIB in View of ZENNA Rejection

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over LEIB in view U.S. Patent No. 4,752,177 to Zenna [hereinafter “ZENNA”].

The Examiner submits that LEIB discloses all of the features of Claim 15 except that LEIB is silent regarding the provision of a utility box. The Examiner then cites ZENNA for its teachings of a motorcycle transport trailer that includes a utility box removably fastened to the first upper platform of the forward support section. Next, the Examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the instant invention was made to have modified the trailer of LEIB to have a utility box removably fastened to the upper platform of the forward support section in accordance with the teachings of ZENNA in order to include on the trailer in proximity to the motorcycle a battery source to charge the motorcycle battery in case of failure and a source of pressurized air to inflate the motorcycle tires.

As already discussed above in the §102 rejection traversal, Applicant submits that LEIB simply does not teach, *inter alia*, a first planar deck substantially covering said first upper platform; and a second planar deck substantially covering said second platform; . . . as is recited in independent Claim 1. Furthermore, ZENNA does not teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a first planar deck substantially covering said first upper platform; and a second planar deck substantially covering said second platform; . . . as is recited in independent Claim 1. Hence, it is submitted that neither LEIB or ZENNA, whether considered individually or in combination, still do not teach the aforementioned features recited in allowable independent Claim 1.

Thus, Applicant submits that dependent Claim 15 is also allowable at least for the reason that this claim depends from allowable independent Claim 1 and recites additional features that further define the present invention.

Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the stated rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of dependent Claim 15 and indicate that this claim is allowable over the art of record.

Application is Allowable

Applicant respectfully submits that each and every pending claim of the present application meets the requirements for patentability, and respectfully requests the Examiner to indicate allowance of such claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that each and every pending claim of the present application meets the requirements for patentability under 35 U.S.C. §§ 112, 102 and 103, and respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate the allowance of such claims.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that none of the references of record anticipate or render obvious the Applicant's invention as recited in Claims 1-5 and 7-16. The applied references of record have been discussed and distinguished, while claimed features of the present invention have been pointed out.

Further, any amendments to the claims which have been made in this response and which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

Accordingly, reconsideration of the outstanding Office Action and allowance of the present application and all the claims therein is respectfully requested and now believed to be appropriate.

If any additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account Number 19-4330.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2/1/05

By: _____



Kit M. Stetina

Customer No.: 007663

Registration No. 29,445

STETINA BRUNDA GARRED & BRUCKER

75 Enterprise, Suite 250

Aliso Viejo, California 92656

Telephone: (949) 855-1246

Fax: (949) 855-6371